III. REMARKS

1. Claims 1-18 remain in the application.

2. A copy of the Abstract on a separate sheet is appended to this response.

3. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-7 are patentable over Kikinis (US 5,220,521) in view of Claxton (US 6,434,371).

The combination of Kikinis and Claxton does not disclose or suggest an electronic input device configured to be moved from a second state to a third state by a sliding movement of a third portion of the electronic input device in a second direction being different than the first direction, as called for by claim 1.

The Office Action states that Kikinis fails to teach an electronic input device with these features, that is, configured to be moved from a second state to a third state by a sliding movement of a third portion of the electronic input device in a second direction being different than the first direction. Applicants respectfully submit that Claxton also fails to disclose or suggest these features.

Assuming that the first state refers to KEYPAD mode of operation, the second state refers to SMARTPHONE mode of operation, and the third state refers to SPEAKERPHONE mode of operation (Claxton; column 2, lines 11-34), it follows that moving the device in Claxton from the first state to the second state consists of opening a flip cover from a closed position to an open position by a rotating movement about a hinge (Claxton;

column 2, lines 11-34; column 5, lines 10-61; Figures 1, 2, and 4). It further follows that moving the device in Claxton from the second state to the third state consist of further opening the flip cover from the open position to a final position as a stand by further continuing the rotating movement about the hinge (Claxton; column 2, lines 11-34; column 5, lines 10-61; Figures 2, 4, and 5).

Therefore, there are at least three significant differences regarding the movements from the second state to the third state between the present application and Claxton.

First, Claxton fails to teach the movement from the second state to the third state being in a second direction different from the first direction. Claim 1 of the present application clearly discloses that the movement from the first state to the second state happens in a first direction, and the movement from the second state to the third state happens in a second direction which second direction is different from the first direction. Rather, Claxton merely teaches the movement from the second state to the third state being a continuation of the rotating movement from the first state to the second state, i.e. in the same direction.

Second, Claxton fails to teach the movement from the second state to the third state being a sliding movement. Rather, Claxton merely teaches the movement from the second state to the third state being a continuation of the rotating movement about the hinge.

Third, Claxton fails to teach the movement from the second state to the third state being accomplished by moving a third portion of the device. Claim 1 of the present application clearly

discloses that the movement from the first state to the second state occurs by moving a first portion of the device in relation to a second portion of the device, and that the movement from the second state to the third state occurs by moving a third portion of the device. In contrast, Claxton merely teaches the movement from the second state to the third state being a continuation of the movement from the first state to the second state, i.e. happening by moving the first portion of the device in relation to the second portion of the device. In fact, Claxton only teaches two portions of the device, i.e. the body and the cover.

These differences are significant because if the first and the second direction differ from each other as disclosed by the present invention, it follows that extending occurs in two different dimensions when opening up the device. Thus more usable area for an interface is exposed than if extending only occurs in one dimension as with Claxton. This is even more obvious in the case of Claxton, where the extending occurs about the same hinge and thus no more usable area for an interface is exposed at all when moving from the second state to the third state.

At least for these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Kikinis and Claxton.

Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1 and therefore are also patentable over the combination of Kikinis and Claxton.

4. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 8-11 are patentable over Kikinis in view of Claxton and further in view of Kinya et al. (JP 04-17684, hereinafter "Kinya").

Kinya discloses a flexible display medium that may be rolled up into a housing. However, like Kikinis and Claxton, Kinya fails to disclose or suggest an electronic input device configured to be moved from a second state to a third state by a sliding movement of a third portion of the electronic input device in a second direction being different than the first direction.

Because the combination of Kikinis, Claxton, and Kinya fails to disclose or suggest these features, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 8-11 are patentable over the combination of Kikinis, Claxton, and Kinya.

5. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 12-15 are patentable over the combination of Kikinis, Claxton, and Kinya and further in view of Furuya et al. (JP 06-164440, hereinafter "Furuya").

Furuya discloses communication equipment having hinges. However, like the above cited combination of prior art, Furuya has no disclosure related to an electronic input device configured to be moved from a second state to a third state by a sliding movement of a third portion of the electronic input device in a second direction being different than the first direction.

Because the combination of Kikinis, Claxton, Kinya, and Furuya fails to disclose or suggest all the features of Applicants' invention, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 12-15 are patentable over the combination of Kikinis, Claxton, Kinya, and Furuya.

6. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 16 and 17 are not anticipated by Makela et al. (US 6,047,196, hereinafter "Makela").

Makela fails to disclose or suggest a flexible input means. The portion of Makela cited in the Office Action (column 3, lines 24-30), describes components including a numerical keypad "realized with components similar to those of prior art mobile phones." Applicants find no disclosure related to a flexible input means, and no disclosure related to at least partially inserting the flexible input means into a space in a housing, as recited by claims 16 and 17.

Makela also fails to disclose or suggest configuring the electronic input device to be moved from a first state to a second state in a first direction, and a movement from the second state to a third state by a sliding movement in a second direction, different from the first direction. The citation of column 3, lines 50-56 discloses that a mobile station may remain in a certain position when unfolded and has no disclosure related to the movement from a second to third position as described in claims 16 and 17.

At least for these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 16 and 17 are not anticipated by Makela.

7. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 18 is not anticipated by Claxton.

As mentioned above, Claxton fails to disclose or suggest an electronic input device configured to be moved from a second state to a third state by a sliding movement of a third portion of the electronic input device in a second direction being different than the first direction, as called for by claim 18.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record, and

are in proper form for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment for any fees associated with this communication or credit any over payment to Deposit Account No. 16-1350.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph V. Gamberdell, Jr. 4/14/2003
Joseph V. Gamberdell, Jr. Date
Reg. No. 44,695

Perman & Green, LLP
425 Post Road
Fairfield, CT 06824
(203) 259-1800
Customer No.: 2512

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted by facsimile to 703/872-9314 on the date indicated below, addressed to the Box AF, Commissioner of Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231.

Date: 4/14/03 Signature: Carolina Rodriguez
Person Making Deposit